



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/574,250	11/30/2006	Michiel Zweers	3135-060949	9012
28289	7590	06/08/2009	EXAMINER	
THE WEBB LAW FIRM, P.C.			MACARTHUR, VICTOR L.	
700 KOPPERS BUILDING			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
436 SEVENTH AVENUE				3679
PITTSBURGH, PA 15219			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/08/2009	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/574,250	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ZWEERS, MICHAEL
	<b>Examiner</b> VICTOR MACARTHUR	<b>Art Unit</b> 3679

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 13-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 13-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Specification*

The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609.04(a) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 13-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- Where applicant acts as his or her own lexicographer to specifically define a term of a claim contrary to its ordinary meaning, the written description must clearly redefine the claim term and set forth the uncommon definition so as to put one reasonably skilled in the art on notice that the applicant intended to so redefine that claim term.

*Process Control Corp. v. HydReclaim Corp.*, 190 F.3d 1350, 1357, 52 USPQ2d 1029, 1033 (Fed. Cir. 1999). It is unclear what term "box" throughout the claims is intended to be used to mean. The accepted meaning is "a container with four sides

and a bottom with or without a lid." The term is indefinite because the specification does not clearly redefine the term nor does any of applicant's structure meet the common accepted meaning noted above.

- The word "means" (line 9 of claim 13) is preceded by the word(s) "securing"; and the word "means" (line 2 of claim 20) is preceded by the word "coupling"; in an attempt to use a "means" clause to recite a claim element as a means for performing a specified function. However, since no function is specified by the word(s) preceding "means," it is impossible to determine the equivalents of the element, as required by 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph. See *Ex parte Klumb*, 159 USPQ 694 (Bd. App. 1967). Applicant is required to:
  - Amend the claims in accordance with MPEP 2181(I) to properly invoke 112<sup>th</sup> paragraph so that the phrase --means for-- or --step for-- is modified by functional language without being modified by sufficient structure, material, or acts for performing the claimed function; or
  - Delete the "means" language from the claims.
- The claim limitation "securing means" uses the phrase "means" but it is modified by some structure "the securing means comprising at least one locking pin" (line 11 of claim 13), material, or acts recited in the claim. It is unclear whether the recited structure, material, or acts are sufficient for performing the claimed function which would preclude application of 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph.
  - If applicant wishes to have the claim limitation treated under 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, applicant is required to amend the claim so that the phrase

“means for” or “step for” is clearly **not** modified by sufficient structure, material, or acts for performing the claimed function.

- If applicant does **not** wish to have the claim limitation treated under 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, applicant is required to amend the claim so that it will clearly not be a means (or step) plus function limitation (e.g., deleting the phrase “means for” or “step for”).
- It is unclear how the phrase “at least partially profiled” (line 17 of claim 13, line 5 of claim 25) is meant to structurally limit the claim. How is a partially profiled element structurally different from a fully profiled element? Don’t all elements necessarily have a full “profile” since all elements have an outline?
- It is unclear if the term “coupling means” (line 2 of claim 20) is meant to refer to the previously recited “securing means” (line 9 of claim 13) or to additional means.
- It is unclear how applicant’s locking pin “length” is “adjustable” (claims 14 and 24). Note that rotation of applicant’s cam does not affect bolt length. The length of the bolt remains constant regardless of the position of the cam. That is to say that positioning the cam does not result in a loss of material from the bolt.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless —

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 13-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ju USPN 5046882.

Ju appears to disclose all of the applicant's claim limitations as best understood by the examiner (see 35 U.S.C. § 112 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph rejections above); including connection elements (13, 1, 6) and locking pin (11) and cam (cam portion of 16). Bottom receptors are best seen in fig.5.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 13-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Littlefield USPN 4194851 in view of Ju USPN 5046882.

Littlefield discloses the majority of applicant's limitations including a locking pin. However the Littlefield locking pin has a threaded nut rather than a cam. Ju discloses a locking pin with a cam (cam portion of 16) that is more quickly and easily secured without the need of wrenches. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Littlefield to use a cam rather than threaded nut for the purpose of more quickly and easily securing the pin without the need for wrenches.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Victor MacArthur whose telephone number is (571) 272-7085. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel P. Stodola can be reached on (571) 272-7087. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197.

June 8, 2009

/Victor MacArthur/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3679